UNITED
NATIONS

A S

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/53/725
S/1998/1148
4 December 1998

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Fifty-third session
Agenda items 62 and 110 (b), (c) and (e)
QUESTION OF CYPRUS
HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS: HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS, INCLUDING ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES FOR IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS
HUMAN RIGHTS SITUATIONS AND REPORTS OF SPECIAL RAPPORTEURS AND REPRESENTATIVES
REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

SECURITY COUNCIL
Fifty-third year

Letter dated 3 December 1998 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 2 December 1998, addressed to you by His Excellency Mr. Aytuğ Plümer, Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see annex).

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter and its annex would be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 62 and 110 (b), (c) and (e), and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Volkan VURAL
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

98-38500 (E) 071298

/...

Annex

Letter dated 2 December 1998 from the Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to refer to the statements made by the Greek and Greek Cypriot representatives at the meeting of the Third Committee held on 10 November 1998, under agenda items 110 (b), (c) and (e) ("Human rights questions"). These statements merely repeat the Greek-Greek Cypriot camp's one-sided views and attempt to conceal, once again, the root cause of the Cyprus dispute for which the Greek Cypriot side and Greece are jointly responsible.

It is a historical fact that the systematic violation of the fundamental human rights of the Turkish Cypriot people by the Greek Cypriots from 1963 lies at the root of the Cyprus question.

The late Greek Cypriot leader Archbishop Makarios openly declared in a public speech at Panayia, in Paphos, on 4 September 1962, only two years after independence, and ironically when he was the president of the partnership Republic of Cyprus, that it was their national duty to expel the Turkish Cypriot people from the island. His exact words were as follows:

> "Unless this small Turkish community forming part of the Turkish race, which has been the terrible enemy of Hellenism, is expelled from the island, the duty of the heroes of EOKA cannot be considered as terminated."

About one year after that ominous declaration, on 21 December 1963, the Greek Cypriots launched armed attacks on the Turkish Cypriots all over the island, in accordance with the insidious Akritas Plan, with an ultimatum that sought to impose amendments to the constitution of the Republic of Cyprus that would reduce the Turkish Cypriot side's status from that of an equal political partner to that of a mere minority.

The Turkish Cypriots defended themselves against Greek Cypriot aggression and did not surrender as the Greek Cypriots expected them to do. However, until 1974 they were made to suffer in every conceivable way by the Greek Cypriots, who usurped all organs of the state in 1963. Turkish Cypriots were ousted from the state and its budget. As it is recorded in the reports of the Secretary-General to the Security Council at the time, a merciless war of attrition was waged by the Greek Cypriot administration against the Turkish Cypriot people. In all of these attacks, the Greek Cypriots were helped and instigated by Greece, which had sent an army 20,000 strong with heavy armaments to the island.

Although negotiations have been going on for nearly three decades, to this day no solution has been possible because the Greek Cypriots do not want to re-establish a new state in Cyprus based on the political equality, sovereignty and partnership of the two peoples of the island.

Mr. Glafkos Clerides, the Greek Cypriot leader, has summed up the Greek Cypriot policy in his memoirs as follows:

"Just as the Greek Cypriot preoccupation was that Cyprus should be a Greek Cypriot state, with a protected Turkish Cypriot minority, the Turkish preoccupation was to defeat any such effort and to maintain the partnership concept, which, in their opinion, the Zurich Agreement created between the two communities. The conflict, therefore, was a conflict of principle and for that principle both sides were prepared to go on arguing and even, if need be, fighting, rather than compromise."

("My Deposition", vol. 3, p. 105, 1990)

It is clear, therefore, that the Greek Cypriots have no regrets about their actions since 1963, which wrecked the original 1960 partnership state and aimed at destroying the political balance that had been established between the two peoples in Cyprus and the two guarantor powers, Turkey and Greece.

On the contrary, in 1990, the Greek Cypriot side did not hesitate to undermine the basis of negotiations under United Nations auspices by unilaterally applying for full membership for "Cyprus" to the European Union, in violation of the 1960 treaties, and they did not even feel the need to conceal their political aim in doing so, which was to do away with all the agreed parameters for a settlement on the basis of political equality and partnership between Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots that had been developed over the years.

The intervention of Turkey in Cyprus on 20 July 1974, which was fully legitimate, being carried out in accordance with her rights and obligations under the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee, was preceded by the coup on 15 July 1974, which had been engineered by Greece with a view to annexing the island. Archbishop Makarios, who managed to escape from Cyprus, appeared before the Security Council on 19 July 1974 and accused Greece of invading Cyprus. He warned that the lives of Turkish Cypriots as well as Greek Cypriots were in danger and asked for assistance (see S/PV.1780 of 19 July 1974).

This is the background and the current situation as regards the Cyprus question and it is ludicrous that the Greek Cypriot representative has tried to present it otherwise.

Peace would be best served if the Greek Cypriots channelled their energies towards an overall settlement, rather than disseminating false propaganda with a view to defaming the Turkish Cypriot side and Turkey. On this note, the Greek Cypriot representative's reference to the case of Titina Loizidou, a Greek Cypriot woman who, with the support of the Greek Cypriot administration, filed an application against Turkey before the European Court of Human Rights, serves as a glaring example of the Greek Cypriot side's exploitation of one of the key aspects of the Cyprus issue, namely property rights, for political purposes.

The question of the settlement of reciprocal property claims between the two sides in Cyprus through an exchange of properties and/or compensation was among the parameters established during the negotiating process under United Nations auspices. This parameter later became part and parcel of the Set of Ideas of 1992. If the Greek Cypriot side was genuinely interested in resolving this issue rather than political posturing, it would accept the recent proposal

made by President Denktaş for the setting up of a joint commission to deal with the reciprocal property claims of both sides as a means of making progress towards a comprehensive settlement.

As regards the issue of missing persons, the Greek Cypriot representative is deliberately misleading the members of the Third Committee. Enough evidence has emerged over the last few years in proof of the fact that the Greek Cypriot administration has been following a policy of callous deceit against its own people, and in particular against the relatives of the so-called missing persons.

In this connection, it will be recalled that a prominent Greek Cypriot journalist, George Lanitis, publicly apologized to his readers for misleading them with his reports on the issue of missing persons, because of his coverage of the story of Andriani Palma, who was 25 when her husband was killed during the events of July 1974 and was officially buried in South Cyprus. However, this was deliberately kept secret from her and she was led to believe, until recently, that her husband was a prisoner in Turkey. She was made to repeat that lie, in protest meetings held for propaganda purposes in South Cyprus or in foreign countries. When the truth came out recently, Lanitis felt very embarrassed and commented about the whole affair in his newspaper. He wrote:

> "She was fooled. I was fooled and many other journalists were fooled and we fooled our readers. I apologize. I acted like the rest of them, bona fide".

(Cyprus Weekly, 1-7 May 1998)

It is noteworthy that what George Lanitis "discovered" in 1998 had, by 1996, already been conceded in international circles. Mr. Gustave Feissel, the former Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General in Cyprus, made the following statement on 5 March 1996:

> "No one has ever given the United Nations Committee on Missing Persons any information, evidence, anything at all, which would suggest that anybody is still alive somewhere."

John C. Kornblum, Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of European and Canadian Affairs of the United States State Department, stated on 20 June 1996:

> "... it is tragic that numerous civilians in both communities lost their lives during the 1963-1974 ethnic violence on Cyprus. It is equally tragic that many of those persons are still listed as 'missing'.
>
> "In the absence of hard evidence to the contrary, it has long been assumed by the United Nations and others that the Cypriot missing are dead."

The late Lord Finsberg, the Council of Europe rapporteur on the situation in Cyprus, expressed similar views in his preliminary report, dated 21 August 1996, under the section dealing with human rights issues.

I would finally point out that the Greek Cypriot side has not yet formally accepted the five point proposals of the Secretary-General for the resolution of the issue of missing persons, which were conveyed to the two sides on 4 April 1996 and 4 December 1996. These proposals were intended to help the Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus to finally resolve the issue in accordance with its Terms of Reference, having regard to the information gathered by the Committee through its investigations since 1981.

The 31 July agreement between the leaders of the two sides is a special agreement outside the framework of the Committee on Missing Persons, which must complete its task under its Terms of Reference agreed to between the two sides through the auspices of the United Nations and the International Committee of the Red Cross. The implementation of this special agreement presupposes the resolution of the issue of the casualties and secret burial places resulting from the Greek engineered coup of 15 July 1974, which lasted five days and which was the cause of large numbers of casualties within the Greek Cypriot community, the details of which are still being kept secret.

In view of the foregoing, it appears that the Greek Cypriot representative does not seem to realize that there are limits even to political posturing. His inference that there is a "refugee" problem in South Cyprus and the deliberate use of other phony or misleading terminology is ludicrous and constitutes an affront to the international community. Indeed, authoritative reports on the situation in Cyprus, namely the Secretary-General's reports on the mission of good offices and peacekeeping operations and the United States State Department's annual human rights reports, suggest that the reality in the island is very different to what the Greek Cypriot side and Greece would have one believe.

Presently, the only real problem in Cyprus is the 35-year-old occupation by the Greek Cypriot side of the seat of government and, as its corollary, the continuous war of attrition against the Turkish Cypriot people and the denial of their vested rights and status in Cyprus. As such, until the international community accords equal treatment to the two states on the island, thus redressing the asymmetry between the two sides, there can be no prospect for a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus dispute.

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter were to be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 62 and 110 (b), (c) and (e), and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Aytuğ PLÜMER
Representative
Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus